THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1942. Vol. XXXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Abandonment of the Use of Force.

The Atlantic Charter, the most authoritative as it is by far the most acceptable of all the declarations on the aims of the war put forth from the allied point of view, declares as its eighth and final aim:

> 'they believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.'

This phrase, 'the abandonment of the use of force,' has been subjected to judicious and drastic criticism by Professor Douglas Johnson in the December issue (No. 375) of *International Conciliation*, published by Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Professor Johnson, who at the close of the Great War played an important part at Versailles in the sphere of geographical problems, prefaces his criticism by asking:

> 'Why should these things be? Why have the bloody sacrifices of the youth of 1914-18, and twenty years of conscientious effort to abolish war, reaped the harvest of conflict and chaos to-day convulsing

> the world? Why did the Armistice of 1918 prove to be merely a truce permitting the enemies of democracy and freedom to arm anew for a yet more deadly assault on civilization? This is the question every thoughtful citizen must ask himself, and for which he must seek earnestly to find the answer.'

Professor Johnson's answer is briefly this:

> 'Mutual agreements to outlaw war as an instrument of international policy will not bring peace, even when combined with agreements to settle differences by peaceable procedures.'

What is lacking in all these proposals is the recognition of the part force plays and must continue to play for generations to come if world international peace is to be secured and maintained. This will seem a very depressing verdict to many good people. We have all, perhaps, become accustomed to accept as final and self-evident such statements as 'Force is no remedy': 'You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them.' Such axioms have appealed to us because they point to what ought to be the case, rather than to what is the case. The writer of these notes recalls his mixed feelings when many years ago he read the inscription on a piece of captured cannon: *Ultima ratio regum*. It seemed to him entirely right that those who professed such views should be defeated and have their weapons taken from them. Yet, how detestable that there should be governments in this modern world who could dare to claim that force in the form of military power was their final argument in international disputes.

Professor Johnson sees that the disasters of the democracies to-day are due in no small part to their failure to recognize the rightful and necessary use of force in the maintenance of peace and in the maintenance of justice and good faith on which peace rests. Professor Johnson, in reviewing all the well-meant efforts to maintain peace during the twenty years between the two Great Wars, asks:

> 'What is the missing element? It is the element of *force*. *Force* to maintain just territorial and economic settlements against the attacks of those who would by violence upset them for their selfish ends. *Force* to sustain the moral judgments of an upward striving civilization against the evil actions of a backward minority. *Force* to implement agreements to outlaw war, restraining the nation that for greed of gain would appeal to battle in defiance of its most sacred pledges. *Force* to compel resort to peaceful methods of settling disputes rather than to the arbitrament of arms. *Force* to assure acceptance of decisions reached through

orderly procedures mutually agreed upon. *Force* to prevent armed conquest of a neighbour's lands, and *force* to give all nations that security and confidence which is the essential prerequisite to general disarmament.'

Why is it that this indispensable function of force has not been recognized by many great and good men in recent years who have made eloquent appeals to replace the physical force of arms by the moral force of right? These appeals, whether of popes and professors, preachers and politicians, publicists and pacifists, even President and Prime Minister, are based upon fallacious reasoning and false antithesis. Such is the conclusion of Professor Johnson. He writes:

'All of these, and countless similar statements, by men of high position and worldwide influence, contrast *force* or *power* on the one hand, with *right* or *justice* or *law* or *order* on the other. There is no such antithesis. The opposite of "force" or "power" is "weakness" or "impotence," not "law" or "order." The opposite of "right" is "wrong"; of "justice," "injustice"; of "law," "lawlessness"; of "order," "disorder" or "anarchy." Their opposites are not "force" or "power."

'The fallacy of comparing or contrasting things which are neither comparable nor to be contrasted would be sufficiently mischievous if nothing more were involved than a careless use of words. For, as statesmen know full well, there is a power in words to shape the destiny of nations. But the fallacy involved in such statements . . . goes much deeper. It is a fallacy of fundamental thought, one which has warped the public opinion of whole peoples, including our own, and paralyzed the efforts of statesmen to banish the curse of war. For these statements are expressions of a deep conviction that force is something essentially evil, something to be shunned as incompatible with a new and higher order of international relations. Such statements are at the same time expressions of the superficial assumption that law and order rest solely *on moral foundations,* and that somehow they perpetuate themselves because consonant with the best interests of mankind. Worst of all, such statements obscure the vital truth that force is one of the *indispensable bases* of law and order. They ignore the fact that in no place and at no time has there ever been evolved any system of peaceable society which did not depend upon force for its very existence.'

Hence the conclusion reached by Professor Johnson is that there is no hope for the establishment of world peace until we recognize practically and unflinchingly that

'peace and order reign only where wise laws, impartially administered, are backed by force.'

That also is plainly the conviction of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, or they would not be fighting this present war. When, however, they maintain in their eighth prin-

ciple of the Atlantic Charter that 'all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force,' they are really using it as the justification for depriving the Axis of every kind of military force, because those states have so atrociously misused force and also because if such powerful enemies to peace are deprived of military power, peace-loving nations will not have to bear the crushing burden of maintaining a military force sufficiently powerful to keep the criminal states from exercising their criminal instincts. These conclusions are sound, although the phrase 'the abandonment of the use of force' which prefaces them in the Atlantic Charter is fallacious and dangerous.

THE GOSPEL FOR TO-MORROW.

For a diocesan bishop to write a Penguin Book must be as rare a feat as the designing of a railway station platform poster by a Royal Academician. The Bishop of Truro's *Gospel for To-morrow** ought to be studied by all who are concerned for the influence of the Christian Religion in this land and the part that the Church of England can play and ought to play as the national focus of Christian influence.

Dr. Hunkin is not a revolutionary nor a reactionary but a very reasonable, practical and modern-minded Christian. As a Cambridge don, as a chaplain during the Great War, winning his M.C. with bar, as Rector and Archdeacon of Rugby, and now as a rural Bishop, he has acquired a sound knowledge of the religion of his countrymen, and has studied the Church of England from many points of view. Such experience should make a sage counsellor in religious matters. As a result, few readers of this Penguin will fail to find the Bishop a skilful physician of the soul, whether it be the soul of the National Church or the soul of an individual Christian. This he is able to do because, as it seems to us, his religion is right and his theology is sound.

The Bishop thus sets forth the intention of his book:

> It is, of course, quite impossible to invent out of hand a brand new religion. And it is quite unnecessary. Man has been religious from

* *The Gospel for To-morrow*, by the Bishop of Truro. Penguin Special, 1941. Price 6*d*.

beyond the dawn of history. A forest of religions already exists. And the particular tree nearest to us may need pruning, certainly does need pruning and other attention, but it is by no means dead. The purpose of this little book is to give this kind of attention to our religion — the Christian religion.

What is the central message of the authentic Christian Gospel? Can it be translated into the language of to-day? (pp. 21-22).

For readers of the *Modern Churchman*, what follows is of singular interest. It describes the inspiring vision of what the Christian Religion might be and essentially is in the words of a great Modern Churchman, Canon J. M. Wilson, the father of the heroic Arnold Wilson, both active members of our movement :

Some years ago on a May evening I sat in an attic room in the beautiful second Court of St. John's College, Cambridge, and listened to a very remarkable address. The speaker was eighty-seven years of age ; he had a long white beard ; he looked like a prophet ; he spoke like a prophet ; he was a prophet—Canon J. M. Wilson, Senior Wrangler in 1859, subsequently Science Master at Rugby and then Headmaster of Clifton. He brought us younger men an inspiring vision of the future.

' My outlook for theology . . . has boundless hope,' he said, and he gave us an outline of his own vigorous and convincing belief.

' The human race is evolving ; and we as individuals are becoming more and more conscious that we are responsible agents, with large freedom, as well as subjects, in this evolution . . . You and I are now, therefore, or may become, conscious and free agents of the Creator. We share something of His vision, His freedom, His power, His will—something of Himself. We are His children. Word it how we will. We are working with our Creator in the making of a new heaven and a new earth. This is a great dynamic, a real evangel. This will grip : and this will come as " news " . . .' (p. 22).

Discussing the urgent problem of Christian Reunion in our own land, the Bishop after sketching the history of Christian dis-union writes :

. . . the position must be reviewed afresh. Each Communion of Christians must try to see clearly and dispassionately and without prejudice what it really values. And those elements which have proved themselves to be of real and substantial worth must, if possible, be shared with others.

As an Anglican I value the effectual symbol of continuity and order provided by the three-fold historic Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I recognise the usefulness of the parochial system (reasonably modified under modern conditions). At the same time, I realise that a more active part in Church life should be played by the laity. Such recent novelties as Parochial Church Councils and the Church Assembly are pointing the way. I admit also that there are a number of things like the Patronage System which still need revision and reform.

I should like to share such advantages as those which I have named with the widest possible circle of Christian people, and I know that their help in correcting the defects to which I have pointed would be invaluable. I hope other Communions will also review their assets and liabilities in this kind of way: and then we shall all soon be ready for a strong centripetal movement. Actually there is unmistakable evidence that such a movement has begun already.

In the meantime the Christian Communions must draw towards each other in closer sympathy and clearer understanding; and there must be fuller mutual recognition.

The Bishop urges, in the matter of our Christian beliefs, that we should try to get 'as near the truth as we can,' and points out that

. . . during the last fifty years knowledge has advanced, and we have come to see the situation much more clearly. To state the requirement of belief in the words quoted above is to press these Creeds harder than they can now bear. We may indeed give them an honoured place in our archives. And more than that, we shall do well to make them the starting-point of our own efforts at restatement.

Continuity is important. And, all things considered, we shall do much better by re-examining the traditional formulae and exhibiting, re-stating, and so re-affirming their main points, than by trying to compose a summary entirely new. What we are trying to find is not a new Religion, but the essential realities which have sustained our fathers in their Religion—the Christian Religion. The result of thorough investigation may well be that some of the things which our fathers thought were the essentials that sustained them were not, in point of fact, the essentials after all. Our fathers on some points were mistaken interpreters of themselves: *but they were sustained.* And we want to lay hold of the *Reality* which actually sustained them and which will sustain us too.

On examination, we find that both the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds present us with six outstanding points . . .

We believe in God the Father All-sovereign,
Maker of heaven and earth;
in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord;
and in the Holy Spirit.
We believe in the Universal Fellowship of Christ's Church;
in the forgiveness of sin
and in life eternal.

The Bishop demands as 'the essential thing' for the Church to-day a 'forward outlook and policy,' and this will have to be implemented in many ways. He sees this forward outlook and policy more manifest in the foreign mission field than in the home-land.

. . . One of the most hopeful signs of Church life to-day is quickened interest in, and concern for, the forward work of the Church overseas. And, indeed, Christianity overseas has made amazing progress. It has been thrilling to read the summaries published from time to time during

recent years by the Missionary Council of the Church of England and by the various Missionary Societies. In certain parts of India and Africa more particularly, advance has been taking place by leaps and bounds.

We could wish that the great majority of the Bishops on the Bench agreed with the Bishop of Truro's practical policy as outlined in *The Gospel for To-morrow*.

WAR-TIME CONVOCATION.

The reports of the proceedings of the recent Convocation of Canterbury must make curious reading for the general public, if the public ever troubles to read the reports. The two resolutions which seemed to have occasioned most debate were :—

(1) A resolution moved by Canon J. N. Bax :

'That this House humbly requests his Grace to appoint a commission to explore the possibility of creating a common Christian front of those bodies that acknowledge the Kingship of Christ, by way of a union, in which each body retains its full freedom of self-government, by what may be likened to Dominion status, while trying to provide common action through a standing committee.'

Canon Bax's endeavour to advance Christian Reunion a stage further than it has at present reached in this country failed in its intention. Instead, Convocation placed on record its thankfulness for the measure of co-operation already achieved among Christian denominations : pointed to the potentialities of the existing Commission of the Churches for Social Responsibility and International Friendship : and desired to impress on all Christian people the need for earnest and increasing prayer for the reunion of Christendom.

We venture two comments. The saintly Bishop Francis Paget wrote a golden sentence which ought to be inscribed on the walls of the chamber in which Convocation sits—'*To do nothing when you ought to be doing something is the height of rashness.*' To exhort Christian people to pray for reunion under such circumstances reminds us of the American minister who told a negro desiring to secure a sitting in his church that it was not possible for him to get a sitting now, but that he might make it a subject of prayer. After the lapse of some months, the negro applied again to the minister, who enquired if he had, as advised, made the matter a subject of prayer. The negro said he had done so. The minister then asked, 'What

answer did the Lord give you?' The negro replied, 'The Lord said to me — Sambo, there's no use your trying to get into that church: I have myself been trying in vain to get into it for years past.'

(2) The other resolution to which we refer was moved by the Bishop of Hereford:

'(*a*) Whereas this House has declared certain variations from the Book of Common Prayer to be allowable by the bishops of the province, in exercise of their administrative discretion, until further order be taken:

'And whereas the desire has been expressed to this House that similar approval should be given to the reading of the Prayer of Oblation introduced by the word "Wherefore" immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, to be followed by the Lord's prayer, before the communion of the priest and people;

'And whereas it has been represented to this House that sanction of this variation, as being more in accordance than the existing order with the traditional arrangement of the various parts of the canon, would assist greatly towards ending irregularities in the celebration of the Holy Commuion whereby offence has been caused to many and others have been hindered in their devotions;

'And whereas this House is of opinion that the use described is consistent with the doctrine of the Church of England;

'This House resolves:

'1. That the use may be approved when duly sanctioned by the bishop;

'2. That accordingly a bishop may permit this use in the exercise of his administrative discretion;

'3. That a bishop should not give his consent until he is satisfied that the proposed use would have the goodwill of the communicants of the parish concerned.

'(*b*) And that, having so declared its opinion, this House enjoins upon all priests in this province the duty of refraining from all deviations from the Order of Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer except such as may be approved by the bishop of the diocese in accordance with any directions or guidance given by this House.'

After much debate this resolution, with slight modifications, was carried.

Ordinary Christian people may well wonder why there should be so much debate about whether in the Holy Communion Service the Lord's Prayer should be said immediately before receiving the Bread and Wine or immediately after receiving the Bread and Wine, and why such a controversial subject — for such it was — should be debated in Convocation during war-time. Such debates reported in the press in war-time can only invite derision — another example of Nero fiddling while Rome

is burning. *Prima facie*, the dispute between the two parties looks like the controversy between the Big-Endians and the Little-Endians in *Gulliver's Travels* or the recurring conflict twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee in *Alice*. But there is more in it than that.

There are reasons for the debate which can only be understood by those who know the history of our Communion Service. Cranmer, in his Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552), placed the Lord's Prayer *after* the Reception of the Elements. But for many centuries preceding 1552 the Lord's Prayer had been said before the Reception of the Elements. Hence some who opposed the resolution felt it to be only one more Anglo-Catholic endeavour to undo the work of the Reformation. Others felt the proposal ought to be opposed because Convocation had no legal right to alter our authorised Communion Service.

We are convinced that this controversial matter ought not to have been brought up at this time, and that the right procedure would have been to appoint a committee to report later on the proposal. We have pleaded for years past for the authorization of alternative Communion Services in which the demands of various schools of Churchmen were met as well as the spiritual needs of a vast multitude of simple folk for whom our present Service is too complicated and too antiquated. But we are convinced that this liturgical reform must be achieved by right legal methods and not by episcopal illegality condoning parochial lawlessness.

We can imagine Tertullian, scornful of administrative difficulties and episcopal compromises, commenting thus on these two decisions of Convocation, 'What the Spirit urges they postpone : what the Law prohibits they condone.'

Dr. Lang's Resignation.

Five Archbishops of Canterbury have been martyred or murdered, but not that number have resigned. Dr. Randall Davidson was the first Archbishop to resign since the Reformation, and his successor, Dr. Cosmo Lang, has followed his example.

Whilst genuine regret has been everywhere expressed at Dr. Lang's resignation, it has been equally widely recognized that the reasons for his resignation command respect and acquiescence. The Primate's main plea for his resignation — that the times demand the initiation of Church policies which he cannot possibly hope at his age to see implemented, and that therefore he ought at once to give place to a younger man—is undoubtedly a sound one.

Many gifts and graces are needed by those who occupy this great office, and our primate has been richly endowed. He succeeded to the chair of Augustine in times of difficulty which increased rather than diminished after his succession. Future historians may reveal much to his credit which contemporary historians have been unable to record.

At least it may be said that during Dr. Lang's Primacy the Church of England has not lost prestige in relation to other Christian bodies in this land, with the possible exception of the Church of Rome. But during the same period, the Church of England has been steadily losing influence with the nation. This would seem to be the effect of a general movement exhibiting itself amongst all Christian bodies, yet it certainly is within the power of the Church of England to turn the tide.

Although Dr. Lang has not brought about Christian Reunion in England, at least he has improved relations with the leaders of Non-conformity: although he has not definitely enlarged theological freedom within our Church — a reform which we regard as of urgent necessity — at least he has shown himself to be tolerant of theological development and divergences: although he has not secured liturgical order by achieving a legal revision of our Church Services, at least he has not checked freedom to experiment liturgically, which may prove to be productive of important results when Parliament next has sufficient leisure to decide the issue between the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England, or its re-establishment on a more comprehensive and effective basis. Had he achieved these things, Dr. Lang would have led his Israel into the Promised Land, or at least across the Jordan, instead of leaving it wandering on the table-lands of Moab.

Perhaps Dr. Lang may not regard any of these aims as desirable. It may be that his conception of the Promised Land is very different from that which we have outlined. Perhaps the serious count against him as Primate will be that he had no forward Church policy, and so never gave any clear lead as to the *route* of march. He may have decided, as we think did Randall Davidson, that his business was not to strive ahead but to lead his forces from behind. British people are not averse from such leadership, but it seems to us that the Church of England is facing a crisis in which this kind of leadership will have to be exchanged for something more inspiring and creative. Dr. Lang's successor, whom we suppose has been already selected, has a task ahead of him which will demand the possession of as large a measure of the sevenfold gift of the Spirit as any Primate has ever needed in our Church's history.

It is the condition of the Christian Religion in this land and especially its relation to the Church of England as the chief agent of that religion here and throughout the British Empire that ought to be the urgent concern of our new Primate. The securing of Christian Reunion at home, the achievement of doctrinal re-statement and simplification, the revision of our Church Services in such a variety of authorized forms as shall secure order, freedom, loyalty and the maximum of helpfulness in Divine Worship, the re-establishment of the National Church on a more comprehensive and effective basis than it at present possesses ought to be primary tasks for our new Archbishop. The advancement of international, economic and social reforms may be, we believe, safely entrusted to our statesmen who are fully awake to the necessities of the situation and possess the necessary experience, power, and resources for accomplishing them effectively.

Surely, to-day, there is a tide in the religious life of our people which, if it be not taken in the flood, the future of our Church at least, if not of the nation itself, must be ineffectively and dismally spent amid moral and spiritual shoals and shallows.

O navis, referent in mare te novi
Fluctus! O quid agis? Fortiter occupa
Portum! . . . . *

* Horace, *Odes*, I, 14.

PLATO'S IDEAL OF EDUCATION AND ITS VALUE FOR TO-DAY

By R. G. Bury, M.A., Litt.D.

AFTER criticizing current educational methods and practice in several of his earlier dialogues, Plato proceeded to enunciate his own positive views on the subject in his two most elaborate works, the *Republic* and the *Laws*. But whereas the former book is mainly concerned with the training of the ruling class (the 'Guardians'), and views primary and secondary education as leading up to advanced study of mathematics and philosophy, little is said of this advanced study in the *Laws*, attention being concentrated on a scheme of training suitable for the mass of the citizens, *i.e.* on primary and secondary education.

If we follow Plato's line of thought we find that the first question to ask about education is 'What is its aim or purpose?' 'What is the teacher trying to do?' and Plato's reply to this is, in form, the same as that of his predecessors, the fifth century Sophists,—'to inculcate virtue' (*aretê*). And for Plato, as for Aristotle, 'virtue' means complete human goodness, comprising all the four cardinal virtues. Having thus fixed the aim, we have next to consider the human material with which the teacher has to deal, for, as Plato rightly saw, we must have a clear insight into human nature, and especially child-nature, before we can hope to frame an adequate scheme of training. Of human nature in general we are told in the *Republic* that there exists in every man something of each of the three elements which go to make up man's soul—the appetitive, the spirited, and the rational or 'philosophic'—the right and harmonious blending of which is indispensable for the attainment of virtue. And we are also told there that the human soul is naturally 'imitative,' with a strong tendency to assimilate itself to its environment and to be 'dyed' by the hues of its sense-impressions. But it is only in the *Laws* that what we might term 'the psychological approach,' as it applies to the mind of the child, is worked out in detail. There, in his analysis, Plato finds in the child four

primary instincts: love of pleasure (and dislike of pain), love of mimicry (or imitativeness), delight in motion of the limbs, delight in motion of the tongue and vocal chords. In addition — and this alone distinguishes the young human from the puppy or the kid — the child possesses a dormant rational element, a latent sense of order; but this takes time to develop, so that in its earliest years the child is at best but semi-rational and its mind is what Pope called a 'chaos of thought and passion all confused.'

This, then, is the human material which the educator has to lick into shape — the child endowed at birth with these four primary instincts and exhibiting them all in a random, disorderly way. But, if he is wise, the Educator will not proceed by way of inhibition and repression of these instincts, nor will he confine himself, like Moses, to a code of 'Thou shalt nots.' Rather, he will avail himself of the natural tendencies of the child to effect his purpose, which is the creation of order in the chaos of the child's soul. Accordingly, the primary training will aim at imposing order on the two kinds of disorderly movements natural to the child — on the bodily movements by teaching rhythm, and on those of the voice by teaching harmony; and thereby the sense of order, already latent, is gradually developed. Hence 'choristry,' a combination of regulated song and dance, should be one of the first subjects of instruction.

Regarding this educational 'choristry' there are three observations to be made. In the first place, it has the advantage of fusing together the two sections into which Greek educational practice was normally divided, *viz.* 'music' and 'gymnastic,' mind-culture and body-culture. Secondly, in Plato's scheme, it is to be rigidly controlled, so that only seemly and noble models are set before the children for imitation: there must be nothing coarse, rude or barbaric in the postures and gestures of their dances or in the tunes and words of their songs; beauty and grace must be observed in all things; for through imitation the models affect the character, so sensitive is the soul to the suggestion which shapes and sounds, words and tunes, convey. Imitation of the virtuous is a high-road to virtue.

Thirdly, this training of the young in 'choristry' is valuable as a preparation for that religious worship which consists in

singing and dancing at the Choral Festivals in honour of the Gods. This is one sample of the religious atmosphere with which the educational system, and civic life in general, as depicted in the *Laws*, is saturated. The Divine sanction is invoked to consecrate the rules of the school as well as of the home, so that good conduct becomes a form of piety, and all right education religious education. The children are to assemble for their lessons at the village temples, and their masters and mistresses, as servants of the Law, are ministers of religion.*

In the *Republic*, too, the early education may be said to begin with religion, in the form of stories about the gods and heroes, the first lessons in 'music.' The divine nature, as Plato shows, is misrepresented by Homer and other poets who often ascribe immoral actions to gods, whereas God must be pictured as wholly good and unchanging, incapable of deceiving or causing evil. And this pure goodness of God is the ideal for human conduct, and men should strive 'to become like unto God.' When thus truly pictured, stories of divine and heroic beings are of high educational value as impressing on the young mind examples of fine character and noble action, which influence by suggestion.

That Plato treats education in general from the religious point of view is evident also from what he has to say about the soul, for it is mainly with the soul that the educator is concerned, body-culture being of value merely as a means to soul-culture. 'The soul,' he tells us, 'is immortal and most divine,' the connecting link between man and God, because of which religion is the expression of a communion based on a real existential relationship. In the great phrase of the *Timaeus*, 'Man is not an earthly but a heavenly plant,' and it is the task of education to renew within him a symmetry, a harmony and a beauty of soul which shall mirror the majestic beauty of those heavenly bodies, 'the army of unalterable law,' which display Soul in its perfection and in their rhythmic motions 'declare the glory of God.'

I may fitly conclude this sketch of Plato's views with a sentence from that eloquent passage in the *Republic* where he stresses once again the vital importance of safeguarding the

* For a fuller treatment of the theory of education in the *Laws* I may refer to my article in the *Revue des Études Grecques*, L. 236-7.

young from debasing influences: only if this is done, he says in effect,

> 'will our youth dwell, as it were, in a land of health, and receive good from every quarter; wherefrom the effluence of works of beauty shall be borne to eye and ear like a breeze which brings with it health wafted from salubrious soils, thus winning them insensibly, from their earliest years, to likeness, sympathy and harmony with that thing of beauty, reason.'

Modern educationists who have studied the *Republic*, if not the less familiar *Laws*, recognize that Plato has much to teach us, and freely adopt, in theory at least, many of his ideas. It is agreed that nurture should be adapted to nature, and that an exploration of the mind of the child and the adolescent is a necessary prelude to any successful method of education. The high importance of right training during infancy and the kindergarten years, and the danger of bad environment, wrong impressions and disturbing emotions during this period, are also generally admitted. And good teachers strive to produce in their pupils the '*mens sana in corpore sano*' which Plato advocates by means of a like combination of 'music' and 'gymnastic.' Naturally, many of the details in his proposals are unsuited to modern conditions since he was legislating for small communities with a wholly different economic system and with a background of history, art and literature quite unlike ours in variety and extent. Yet, *mutatis mutandis*, most of his leading principles are, as I would claim, worthy of serious consideration, and many of them, as I have indicated, have already found a place in modern textbooks. Amongst those which are as yet insufficiently appreciated, in some quarters at least, is the principle that the formation of character and the cultivation of the moral sense should be the main object of the educator. Being rather than knowing is what matters, and mastery of facts and theorems is no compensation for lack of 'right reason' and moral balance. In other words, it is the soul as a whole that is to be trained and not merely one part of it, such as the intellectual faculty or the 'spirited' element.

Another point in Plato's doctrine which deserves notice is this: he regards the child as father not merely of the man but of the citizen, so that he should be trained up to be not only a virtuous person but also a worthy citizen. This means that both

teachers and pupils should be imbued with a certain civic sense, so to call it, a consciousness of responsibility to the community which makes of education something more than a merely private and self-regarding affair: each is the concern of all, all of each. The cultivation of such a civic spirit, infused by altruism and patriotism, is surely a thing to be encouraged even where schemes of education are wholly secular. In a scheme such as that in the *Laws* it is much more than incidental or subsidiary: it is an essential part of the scheme, because that scheme is religious and framed in and by a Theocracy. There the civic spirit is one with the spirit of religious awe and devotion, patriotism fused with duty to God. Things are different with us to-day: our polity is no Jewish or Platonic Theocracy but something very much more like a democracy. How then can we hope to cultivate the civic spirit in a religious atmosphere, as Plato schemed to do?

This brings us to the subject of 'religious education,' the need, and the neglect, of which has been so much discussed of late. Perhaps Plato can help us here. If we assume with him that all right education is religious education it must follow that religion should not be taught as merely one amongst a dozen subjects of study, and that a subject bearing no obvious relation to any of the others; a subject, too, all the more likely to be crowded out as being, apparently, of little practical or commercial value. Now it seems to have dawned of late upon our educational experts that

> 'all subjects of instruction should be organized into a unified system, the various units of which should be consciously related to one another in the minds of the pupils.'

This being granted, let us Platonize further and seek the unifying principle in the religious postulate that the universe is ruled by a Creative Spirit, all-wise and all-good, who is the Source and Inspirer of all goodness, beauty and truth; and that of this God all men are children, and that 'assimilation to God,' as Plato puts it, is the chief end of man and the purpose of all his education. Moreover, let us agree that this 'assimilation' is possible inasmuch as man is endowed with faculties fitted for seeking Truth, admiring Beauty, loving Goodness, and thus realizing in himself something of the Divine character. This

conception of Man and God, and their essential connexion, furnishes us with the Religious Ideal which, as unifying principle, should control all the life of the school and, linking together all the manifold subjects of instruction, impart a new and higher significance to them all.

As regards the particular means by which this religious ideal is to be brought home to the pupils so as to serve as a unifying principle, this is a matter which must be left to the practical teacher, as he alone knows fully the conditions and possibilities; but a few general suggestions may be offered here. The subjects of the ordinary school curriculum (apart from specific instruction in religion) may be said to be of religious import if treated as aiming mainly at three things, *viz.* (*a*) the developing and sharpening of the intelligence; (*b*) the furnishing of the mind with true ideas and facts; (*c*) the sharing of a common culture and mental interests with one's fellow-men; for these aims are concerned with the culture of the God-given faculty of reason and the pursuit of that Divine 'value,' Truth. Further, the learner might be led to see that self-culture is a religious duty not only to oneself but to one's neighbours, to fit one to become a worthy member of the Divine-human family; and thus it becomes also a duty to the Kingdom of God. Finally, it goes without saying that worship and prayer should form an essential part of the daily life of the school, helping it to keep in spiritual touch with its Spiritual Head and to realize itself as a united Divine family, conscious from day to day of its high calling.

In conclusion let it be said that however ill-suited to modern conditions, however impracticable to-day, many of Plato's proposals may appear to be, no thoughtful teacher can fail to be impressed by the stress he lays on the value of each human soul and the lofty ideals which he sets before those who undertake its education. If we agree with the poet that 'Heaven lies about us in our infancy,' then we may say, in the spirit of Plato, that it is the task of the educator to make sure that it never does 'die away and fade into the light of common day,' but rather illumines the soul ever more and more brightly with rays from that celestial 'light which never was on sea or land,' yet shines still and for ever over 'the ocean of Beauty' and 'the plain of Truth.'

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By Sir Cyril Norwood, D.Litt., President of St. John's College, Oxford, and President of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

IN that region still distant, which we are to enter after the war, great changes are slowly taking shape which will profoundly affect our social and economic systems, and our religious and political outlook. No one can prophesy with certainty what exactly these changes will be: it is like a cloud-landscape which forms, dissolves, and reforms before our eyes, and gives us only the certainty that there will be hard weather to go through. Many groups of officials and experts, of independent thinkers, and of citizens of good-will, are already engaged in endeavours to think out this problem and that, and to make their contribution to reconstruction. Is not the time come that the Modern Churchmen's Union, which has for some time past been uncertain of its course, like a ship waiting for a wind, should both as a whole and in its branches, address itself boldly to the problems in which it is capable of rendering real service to the nation, to the Christian religion, and to the Church, to the problem of religious education, of Christian re-union, and the maintenance of that tolerant and comprehensive freedom of which the *Doctrinal Report* is the Charter?

It is of the first of these that I wish specially to write, though it is not necessary to think long or deeply about the problem, before it becomes apparent that all these problems are vitally inter-connected. On religious education it is easy to generalize, but it is hard to be practical, to define a policy, and to name the next step with precision. It is necessary to attempt the task, since it is possible that even before the end of the war Parliament may be called upon to address itself to the planning of educational reconstruction. There is visible a real stirring of the waters, and an intense interest in many quarters, both enlightened and less enlightened, above all, much good-will and a genuine desire to do what is right for the nation as a whole. In what is known as the *Green Book*, a statement prepared in, and for the Board of Education, expert administrators have provi-

sionally stated, not so much what will be, as what might be, in a world much richer and much more prosperous than is likely to exist after the war. They have stated a long term ideal which can only be implemented in stages, but undoubtedly the first stage will be entered upon soon. I think it to be equally beyond doubt that the Christian Churches can exercise a good influence on this movement, if they are wise, and far-sighted, and I hope that these qualities will not be absent from the policy which the Modern Churchmen's Union will pursue.

Let us begin by looking at the facts. What is to be said of the religious condition of this country, in which there does exist in many different quarters a genuine desire for religious education to be instituted in all schools, however different may be the interpretation of the term? If these facts are neglected, we may so easily strain after some ideal which is not, and at present cannot be, within our reach, and we must never forget that religious education is a topic on which misunderstanding is easy, prejudice is always lying in wait, and stubborn passions are quickly roused. If we look first at the educated directing classes of our nation, the lay men and women who sustain the whole fabric of our common life, we may say of perhaps the majority of them that though they do not acknowledge any close denominational loyalty, and sit loose to the Churches, they are yet adherents of Christianity, and believe sincerely, if vaguely, in the supreme value of the things of the Spirit. They accept the ethical teaching of Jesus as the truest gospel yet given to man, they believe in God, a term to which they would give all sorts of interpretations, they do not know the Bible as their grandfathers did, and they are more and more losing hold on the expectation of personal immortality.

Among them are to be found two minorities, which are as vocal as the majority is silent, both fervent and both convinced, who will certainly compel a hearing for themselves when education becomes the subject of national debate. The first of these demands a dogmatic and definite Christianity, and rejects anything less as a watered down and worthless substitute: it denies that Christian education exists, or can exist, in schools which are not demoninational, and in which the doctrine and discipline favoured by the denomination are not impressed on all. The

other, recruited from various sources, holds that progress cannot really be made until religion is banished from the schools, until education, as they say, ceases to be the prop of the past, and becomes the seed-ground of the future, until schools cease to look backward to tradition, and look forward instead to a new order. It becomes of the first necessity to banish Christianity and the Churches, and to rely for inspiration and sure guidance on biology and psychology, which will be the universally accepted and reliable guides of the pedagogues of the future.

All these taken together, however important they may be because of the positions which they hold, and the influence they exert, are for all that but a minority in the great mass of the nation. In that great mass a majority, which is becoming a large majority, tends to stand outside the sphere of religion altogether. By stress of economic circumstance it is becoming increasingly materialistic in outlook, but good nature, mutual helpfulness, and strong common-sense abound. Its members may still associate the rites of religion with their christenings, marriages and funerals, but for the rest of their lives they are pagans, for the most part of a very decent type. They also have their minorities, the class-conscious and politically-minded section which wholeheartedly believes the Marxian profession that religion is dope and the Church a cunning instrument of capitalism; the thoughtful and the puritan section, now declining in numbers, which carries on the high tradition of the best of Non-conformity; the evangelical and earnest section with an eagerness to be known by their fruits, of which a shining example is the Salvation Army, and also a section larger than is often suspected, once unkindly described as 'the Protestant Underworld,' a welter of sects and congregations, Bible-punchers and soap-box gospellers, whose ignorance is only equalled by their blind exclusiveness. These serve only to bring into disrepute the Christianity which they blatantly profess. In all this wide area of the population it is to be feared that the influence of the Established Church is becoming increasingly negligible.

If I am at all right in this very broad analysis of the religious state of the nation, it is obvious that the present condition bears all the marks of instability: it is not going to stay as it is. Either Christianity will be discredited, and the Churches cease

to exercise influence, or there will be a counter-movement under the stress and suffering of the war. The matter in debate is whether our New Order is to be based on spiritual or materialistic values: humanly speaking, one cannot foretell which way it will go. In the score of years which separated the two wars in which the nation has had to fight for its life, the record of the Church has not been beyond criticism, and though I do not count myself among those who lightly and readily criticize the Church and its leaders in the very difficult days through which we have passed, I must in honesty point to directions in which there seems to me to have been failure.

In a period in which for the greater part the world has been moving from bad to worse, and in its later years has clearly been threatened by Antichrist, the Church started out with broad conceptions of Reunion, but the stream of progress in that direction seems long to have disappeared into the sands. Spectacular acts of reunion with the Greek Orthodox Church make no impression on the bulk of the nation at all, if the parson does not know the Non-conformist minister as he goes the daily round of the parish, if he cannot invite him to speak from the church pulpit on a Sunday evening, if there never can be any act of real intercommunion between fellow-Christians who dwell in the same neighbourhood, or who are partisans of a single cause. Again, the Church started out with a broad and tolerant definition of permissible doctrine, but instead of opening its doors and urging the educated and critical to come in and strengthen the whole body, it left the Doctrinal Report to lie in neglect, and allowed it to be understood that though some of these views, if held, would not be proper grounds for excommunication, they could not be regarded as satisfactory in one who claimed to be a full and loyal member of the Church. It is not merely that it took the attitude, that you may think liberally, on these questions, but you ought not to do so, but it has shown in several quarters that it is moving backwards from, and not towards, a genuine comprehensiveness and a real toleration. It is therefore not surprising that an increasing number of educated men and women are feeling that in the coming reconstruction there is little or nothing to be hoped from the Church of England, and in humbler quarters too there is a widespread impression that

ordinary folk are not getting from their parish clergy the sort of ministry which they desire. It has fallen to me to deal with a number of resolutions from country parishes up and down the country, passed by Parochial Church Councils, and describing the sort of incumbent whom they desire to have. They are of a strangely similar type. They ask for a married man who is not associated with any ecclesiastical party, who will visit his parishioners and be friendly, and who will take an interest in the welfare of the young people, who are out of hand. I cannot speak of the great urban districts, but it is a matter of easy observation to see that there the parochial system has broken down, and that some different sort of organisation is becoming necessary.

In these circumstances it is becoming clear that a strong forward movement in national education is taking shape. It is certain that the Local Education Authorities will be charged with the duty of providing continuous education up to the age of fifteen for all children, probably without cost to the parents. It is hoped by many that this age will soon be raised to sixteen, and that through the new youth movement and other existing educational agencies there will be control and supervision up to the age of eighteen. It is held on many sides that the voluntary school system, as hitherto known, cannot survive, and that the State and the Local Authorities must take over the complete charge and control of all free education at every stage. If any Church wishes to establish or maintain schools on a strict denominational basis, they would probably, subject to public inspection, be allowed to do so, but they will not be in a position to expect much substantial help from public funds. The Church of England would be well advised to accept these proposals, and even to welcome them, if they are made. The proper maintenance of its schools has for some time been beyond its strength, and in the standards which will be set in the new generation, it will be quite impossible. On its side the Church should throw all the influence which it can command into the policy of securing that religious instruction on simple Christian lines in accordance with an agreed syllabus be given in all schools. At the same time it should throw all the resources which it can gather into the provision of good training colleges, since in all education it

is not rules and regulations that matter in the long run in any degree comparable with the character and equipment of the man or woman who actually teaches in the school. It is the teachers who count, not the Board of Education, nor the Local Authority. What manner of men and women are these going to be?

This is not the moment, nor the place, in which to write a disquisition on the training of teachers, but there will be need for root and branch reform in the training colleges, if the purposes which are near the hearts of many are to be accomplished. There is the attractive ideal of a single profession of teachers in which all will work with equal responsibility and parity of status and esteem, in whatever quarter of the field their work may lie. It is at present, and perhaps in any case, an impracticable ideal, but we can with advantage move much nearer towards it than we are at present. And to bring it nearer we shall need ultimately colleges which are post-graduate, and exhibit less of the seminary spirit: at present teachers are earmarked from their early days, handled too rigidly, and kept too remote from the general flow of contemporary thought. At present in the elementary field they are thought of, and treated, as an inferior article: until present methods are changed an inferior article they will remain.

One of the courses which they should be enabled and encouraged to follow should be the study of Christianity, which should find room not only for the study of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge, but also for the elementary exposition of Christian ethics and comparative religion. I think that it is essential that teachers, if they are to give religious instruction in the schools of the future, should be more thoroughly instructed themselves. Here I find myself somewhat at issue with the view put forward by Mr. Henderson in the December number of the *Modern Churchman*. In 'Headmaster's View of Religious Education' he seems to ride lightly over this difficulty, when he says 'Experts can, and do, give short intensive courses.' Such courses are admirable in many cases, and they may be all that the earnest teacher can at the moment get, but they are not enough to give him that sense of self-confidence which comes from the possession of some body of knowledge, really at command, which the teacher needs to-day and will increasingly need

in the classrooms of the future. Until they possess it, teachers will continue to decline and elude the duty of 'Teaching Scripture.'

The soundest and most authoritative report on Scripture in schools is to be found in the fifth chapter of the *Spens Report*, which dealt with secondary education with special reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools. But it has really a wider range than that, since we must contemplate the situation when all children will stay at school until sixteen. The Consultative Committee, which proposed it, had in my opinion just grounds for their belief that 'the present temper of public opinion is such that the educational issues involved in the teaching of Scripture may be faced fairly on their own merits and that they are no longer obscured by past controversy.' They point to several agreed syllabuses of religious instruction already in operation in elementary schools, to the valuable Association of Teachers of Religious Knowledge, which has already developed into an Institute of Christian Education, to the many conferences and courses which take place. They recognize that the Bible can neither be mere Literature, nor mere History, and they ask for a historical and objective approach which will bring to the pupils a true sense of the meaning which the book studied had for those who wrote it and for those for whom it was written. They recognize the high standard of teaching which the successful accomplishment of such an object demands, and they come down in favour of providing, at any rate in large schools, a specialist teacher. This solution is useful and probably necessary in the secondary school with a leaving age of eighteen, but our problem is wider than this. It is how to get into the schools a sufficient number of qualified teachers who can deal intelligently with the whole mass of the school population.

Here then we are near the crux of the problem. There have been conferences of religious leaders of good will, and agreed syllabuses have been the result. There have been reports of value, such as the one which I have just summarized. But I do not think that there has as yet been a real attempt to call the teachers into conference, and the danger lies in this, that there is a growing feeling among the teachers that this question is one in which an attempt is being made to settle it over their heads.

They fear 'Tests for Teachers' and bars to promotion: they fear the imposition of dogma, and the circumscribing of their intellectual freedom. They have the power to wreck any scheme, and they will most certainly use it, if they are not brought into full consultation. It may be that too much water has flowed under bridges in the last forty years for it to be now possible to secure the whole-hearted co-operation which was once possible, and on this topic Mr. Henderson in his recent article writes much that is pungent and true. An attempt to impose a doctrinal or dogmatic system on the schools is bound to result in failure, and may well end in driving religious instruction as a serious subject out of the great majority of our schools. But I do not take as yet a pessimistic view, if the Churches show breadth and wisdom. If the teachers are asked to co-operate in training on a Christian foundation a generation which will accept a spiritual basis for living, and seek in freedom to apply the Gospel to social, economic, and international life, they will, I believe, respond, and more and more whole-heartedly as they come to realize that the dangers of which they have been afraid have no real existence. The teachers must be consulted and trusted from the start, and there must be no imposition of orthodoxy. They will then produce for the Churches not fully-trained Christians, no finished articles, but such a foundation on which to build the life of the Churches as has never yet existed in this country.

But I am compelled in honesty to say that I feel that the teaching of morality, and the valuation of Christianity as no more than a system of ethics, will not be enough. At this point again I take a position slightly different from that of Mr. Henderson, for while he writes that we want morality taught in our schools, I want morality taught with a Divine sanction. Even if we can mean no more by the conception of God than a Power not ourselves making for righteousness, it is more possible to build on that than on the colder conception of moral conduct, which unsupported by the idea of a Divine order and a Divine will can easily become no more than an enlightened selfishness, and so easily fail in a moral crisis or a strong temptation.

We must not expect spectacular or immediate results. The opportunities of religious instruction are limited, and to begin

with they will not amount to more than a weekly lesson over a period of four or five years. And that is not much when you reflect that the children, so far as a very large part of them is concerned, get nothing from the background of their homes, where their parents either have nothing to give or do not give it. Nor do they get anything from the Churches, because they do not attend. This being the hard truth, it will be well to be wary of that besetting sin of the ambitious teacher, the drawing up of a specious and over-elaborate syllabus. The schools would be wise to concentrate on what can be done to teach the Bible, and to try to bring it about that the very words of the Gospel shall become part and parcel of the mental make-up of the pupils. In fact in schools in which the leaving age is 15 or 16, I should be content if the entire effort of the school on the side of religious instruction were spent in imparting a real and intelligent knowledge of the four Gospels, and omitted the Old Testament entirely. For it is the Gospels which matter supremely to the modern world: they alone speak the word of life of which it stands in need, and which it is ready to hear.

I have so far kept carefully to the term, religious instruction. But every schoolmaster knows that this is only a part, and often only the less important part, of the field which he seeks to cultivate. Most teachers, like Keats, regard life, and particularly school life, as 'a vale of soul-making,' and they know that character will be warped, or built true, according as the life of the school is wrong or right. It is well that school prayers should occur every day, that they should not be formal or slovenly, that they should be a ceremony of some dignity in which teacher and taught co-operate, in which school music helps to produce a corporate service which comes to be felt as the act of the school. It is well that once a year there should be a sense of school dedication, or commemoration, probably held in the parish church, such as can make even a young child realize that he is part of a stream of life, constantly renewing itself and constantly preparing itself for service. The whole life of the school should come to be felt as lived in an atmosphere of mutual help, where something is required from each, as a contribution to the common whole, something that is the individual's own, and not less than the best which he has to

give. The whole work of the school should be built round the standards of what is true and what is beautiful, and it should not be hard to realize that through goodness, truth and beauty we grow year by year into a fuller knowledge of God. No school can fully realize such ideals, but where it succeeds in part, it becomes a place in which you can speak without hypocrisy of religious education, and such a place every schoolmaster would wish his school to be.

Therefore in the schools of the future let us try to build the foundation right, on truth, sincerity, freedom, and tolerance, and so endeavour to send forth future generations imbued with the desire for free service for the sake of the good.

ZOROASTRIANISM AND ITS INFLUENCE

By C. N. Seddon, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford.

IRAN, which we used to call Persia, and may perhaps — at our Prime Minister's suggestion — again call Persia, is an extensive country containing several large provinces. In old times the north-western part was Media; the south and south-west was Pars, or Fars. The great Achaemenian dynasty came from Pars: Cyrus and Darius were Persians, and this is the reason why the whole country was Persia to the Greeks and Romans, and therefore to ourselves. There were several dialects in ancient Iran. They were all closely allied to the Sanskrit of the *Vedas* — so much so that whole lines of the *Avesta* can be put into Sanskrit with very little change. The Aryan invaders of India were close relations of the ancient Iranians. It is therefore not surprising that the religion of the *Vedas* differed little from that of the clans which remained in Iran or settled there. We find them all worshipping a number of gods who mostly represent the phenomena of nature which could not fail to impress themselves on the minds of early men. Benveniste writes of 'the primitive form of the Iranian religion thoroughly impregnated with polytheism and paying homage to the deified forces of nature.' We are here, he says, 'nearer Vedic beliefs

than the Zoroastrian system.' But this primitive Aryan religion developed very differently in Iran and India. The *daevas*, or *divs*, in Iranian belief were demons; in India *dev* means a god, a divine being. *Ahura* in Persia equals *asura* in India; but *Ahura* is the name of the Supreme Being, and *asura* is an evil spirit. There is, in fact, very little in common between later Iranian and Indian religion, ritual, and philosophy. The various developments of Iranian religion — such as Zarvanism, Mithraism and Zoroastrianism — have a great deal in common, so that it is often difficult to say what particular Iranian cult can be held responsible for traces of Persian religious influence discernible in other faiths.

Whether Zoroaster was a real historic personage has indeed been doubted by a few ultra sceptical authorities, but it is now generally agreed that he lived and that the main events of his life are known. As to his date, that too has been given with large variations, ranging from 6000 B.C. to 500 B.C. But the date now usually accepted for his birth is about 650 B.C. He was probably born in Western Iran, and possibly in the neighbourhood of Lake Urumiya, or, as Tha'alibi states, at Mughan. Spitama Zarathushtra was his name as it appears in the *Avesta*: we adopt the Greek form Zoroaster. Spitama is a tribal or family name meaning white; the derivation and meaning of Zarathushtra are unknown, or at least not certain. When a young man he retired from the world and gave himself up to meditation. At the age of thirty a revelation was vouchsafed to him, and he entered upon his ministry. Seven visions came to him, and there is a temptation which, in Jackson's[1] words, offers an indirect parallel to that in Buddhism and in Christianity. The visions were spread over ten years. But the prophet's early efforts for reform met with no success. Eventually, however, he converted a prince named Vishtasp, or Gushtasp, which is the modern form of the name as used by Firdawsi in the *Shahnama*. He was once supposed to be Vishtasp (or Hystaspes), the father of Darius the Great, but this identification is now generally held to be impossible, although Herzfeld still supports it. Zoroaster's patron was probably a prince of Eastern Iran. Religious wars between

[1] I must acknowledge my debt to my friend the late Professor Williams Jackson, of Columbia University, whose writings I have freely used.

Vishtasp and Arjasp of Turan followed, in which Zoroaster lost his life. There are many different accounts of the way in which he met his death. Tha'alibi states that he was assassinated at Fasa in Fars, which he had himself founded. In the *Shahnama* he is said to have perished in a Turanian attack on Balkh. By tradition he was 77 years old when he was killed. Zoroaster's reforms were probably a purification of the old Iranian religious practice of sorcery and devil worship, an emphasis on its dualistic features, a clarification of eschatological beliefs, and the promulgation of a highly developed code of morality and ethics.[2]

We must now consider Zoroastrianism as it appears in the *Avesta*. Perhaps a few words about the *Avesta*, or sacred book of the Zoroastrians, may be useful to those who do not know much about it. It is a composite whole—a collection of writings. Its language is one, or perhaps two, of the old Iranian dialects, differing considerably from the Old Persian of the inscriptions. It is not known in what script it was originally written; as it exists now it is written in a modification or simplification of the Pahlawi character. It is a remnant of a much more extensive work or collection of works, most of which have disappeared, tradition saying that they were burnt at Persepolis by Alexander. In it are what are known as the *Gathas*, which are supposed to be the very words of Zoroaster; and this may be at least partially true. It was commonly known as the *Zend-Avesta*, but this double word really indicates the *Avesta* and its Pahlawi commentary. *Zend* means commentary. It consists of liturgical chapters or books, a priestly code, songs of praise, and a collection of short prayers. In the liturgical portion, or *Yasna*, are included the *Gathas*, written in a metrical and archaic language.

Now in Zoroastrianism dualism is the key-note, the antagonism of the principles of good and evil. Ahura Mazda makes what is good; Anra Mainyu mars it. It is a monotheistic and optimistic dualism, as it postulates the utlimate triumph of the good and the annihilation of all evil. Ahura Mazda—the name means 'The Lord who is Wisdom'—has his throne in the heavens, in the realm of eternal light. He has his Holy Spirit, Spenta Mainyu. He is surrounded by a host of ministering angels. The

[2] Professor Keith has referred, with apparent approval, to the 'view that Zoroaster was less of an innovator than might be gathered from his fame.'

chief of these are the Amesha Spentas—the immortal holy ones, or archangels—six in number, to whom is often added Sraosha, the angel of obedience, making seven in all, brought forth by Ahura Mazda to aid him in his work. Besides them there are Yazatas, or inferior angels, who serve to transmit the will of the Lord to mankind, and to carry it out in detail. The Yazatas are numbered in thousands.

But Ahura Mazda (or his Holy Spirit, Spenta Mainyu) is constantly thwarted by Anra Mainyu, the Evil Spirit or Devil, who is for the time at least almost equal to Ahura Mazda. He created a host of demons who carry out his will, as the Yazatas carry out that of Ahura Mazda. He, too, has six assistants, who are the opponents of the Amesha Spentas, and a number of inferior devils, fiends, sorcerers, and monsters. The etymology and meaning of the word Anra are doubtful.

Like other religions, Zoroastrianism has its own speculations as to the origin of the world and the final end of men and things. In Boundless Time is an age of 12,000 years, divided into four equal periods, each of 3,000 years. In the first Ahura Mazda produced his creatures in a spiritual state, during which Anra Mainyu fled into the darkness and remained in a state of confusion. In the encounter which occurred Ahura Mazda used the holy prayer *Ahuna Vairya*, which existed before the creation —'in the beginning was the word.' In the second period Ahura Mazda creates the material world, and Anra Mainyu his demons and fiends. Ahura Mazda's creations are first the sky; then water; then the earth, plants, animal life, mankind. The third period saw Anra Mainyu's attack, bringing upon the earth blight, corruption, and noxious creatures. It included the history of the human race up to the coming of Zoroaster and the Conversion of Vishtasp. The final period lasts to the Day of Judgment. It includes the coming of the Saviour (Saoshyant), and at its close the general resurrection of the dead will take place, after which Ahura Mazda is to triumph over Anra Mainyu, and the good will reign supreme.

Man consists of body and soul. The soul existed before the body, and lives on after it. But at the resurrection the body will be restored again. After death the soul hovers for three days near the body, and experiences joy or sorrow according to the

deeds done by the body in life. On the fourth day the soul departs, and is met by a beauteous maiden or by a hideous hag, which represents the character of the dead man. It is then conducted to the Chinvat Bridge—the Bridge of Separation—and thence to heaven or hell. For men whose good and evil are equally balanced there is an intermediate place, where souls await the general resurrection. This general resurrection is preceded by the advent of the Saoshyant—Saviour or Messiah—who works for the renovation of the world. According to the *Pahlawi Bundahishn*, which is believed to be based on an earlier Avestan text now lost, the resurrection of the dead extends over a period of fifty-seven years, at the end of which all the dead are awakened and all men stand up. No satisfactory explanation of the number fifty-seven has yet been offered. At the resurrection, a flood of molten metal over-spreads the earth to cleanse it from its sins. Through this all men must walk, but to the righteous it seems no more than warm milk.

Space permits only a few words on the ethical teaching of Zoroastrianism. Man has free-will, and his good and bad actions are written in a book, and are weighed in a balance at the Judgment. The Zoroastrian must practise good thoughts, good words, good deeds. Virtues may be summed up as purity in body and soul, uprightness, charity, benevolence, the faithful keeping of one's word, the avoidance of deceit and lying,[3] keeping out of debt, and shunning theft and robbery. 'In short,' says Jackson, 'we may find in the Zoroastrian moral and ethical code almost every article of our own duty toward God and duty toward our neighbour.' In Zoroastrianism there is no approval of asceticism. It is far removed from Indian ideas in this respect. Primitive Christian asceticism took its rise in Palestine and Egypt, not in Persia. It is proper, however, to note one practice which we consider wrong—the emphasis on the duty of marrying a near relative, even where we should think such a union incestuous. This practice was probably due to a primitive desire to maintain the purity of an Aryan race, and it is need-

[3] This harmonizes with the well-known statement of Herodotus that to speak the truth was one of the three things which the Persians taught their sons. The Zoroastrian reverence for truth is seen in the Behistun inscription which refers to the mischief done by *draugha*, the lie—in modern Persian *durugh*.

less to say that it has long ago ceased. Here must be mentioned the special rules designed to preserve the purity of the elements —earth, fire and water. These include the rules for the disposal of the dead in *dakhmas*, or Towers of Silence, and explain the reverence shown to fire—such reverence, indeed, as has led to the general belief that Parsees are fire worshippers. Fire was probably actually once worshipped in *Atash Kadas*, or Fire Temples.

Such is a very brief account of the Prophet of Iran and his teachings. Before considering how his or other Persian ideas may have influenced Jewish thought a note of caution is required. It must not be supposed that one form of religious belief prevailed over the whole of the Iranian territories. And we do not know exactly when Zoroastrianism became widely spread over Iran. Huart states that under the Achaemenians in early times there were three religions—that of the King, that of the people (known to us chiefly from classical writers), and that of the Magi. The beliefs and practices of the people must have varied, and Herodotus, Strabo and others probably drew their information from people who could hardly claim a knowledge of a whole family of kindred faiths. Benveniste believes that much was drawn from Zarvanite sources. Whether the early Achaemenian kings were Zoroastrians is a question that has been much debated. Benveniste and Huart do not think they were. Geldner in his article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* writes :

> 'Darius and his descendants were without doubt devoted adherents of Zoroastrianism.'

Herzfeld in his Schweich lecture is equally positive, arguing from an inscription on the tomb of Darius and from Darius' own name; he holds that Darius' father Vishtasp was in truth the prophet's patron. His arguments do not convince me. Jackson thought that, while the later Achaemenians were Zoroastrians, the religion of the earlier kings is doubtful. In these circumstances I think we must suspend judgment on the point. In the Behistun inscriptions Darius always calls the usurper Gaumata 'the Magian.' Either Darius or the Magians were not then Zoroastrians. Later on the Magians were Zoroastrian priests and wise men, but originally they were a Median tribe, and they

may well have stood out against Zoroaster's early preaching. The opposition of a Magian to Darius does not therefore carry us far. Yet on the hypothesis of Achaemenian Zoroastrianism one would expect some mention of Zoroaster in the Cuneiform inscriptions, or something clearly indicating belief in his teaching. It has often been observed that the burial of the Achaemenian kings in rock-hewn or stone-built tombs is inconsistent with the practice prescribed in the *Avesta*. And not only were kings buried in this way, but Herzfeld states that near the tombs of Darius and his successors close by Persepolis there are similar, though smaller, private tombs.

But perhaps this does not very much matter. For even if Jewish contact with the Persians was rather with followers of creeds not specifically Zoroastrian, there can be little doubt that there was a wide sphere of beliefs common to all Iranian systems. For Zoroaster did not introduce a fresh faith, but reformed an old one. If Cyrus and his successors were not Zoroastrians, at all events they accepted many of the beliefs common to all Iranian religions, among which we can safely reckon the main features of the Reformer's preaching.

Zoroastrianism would seem to have exercised a powerful influence on Christian eschatology. The details of the Resurrection and final Judgment, as described in the Gospels, are reminiscent of Zoroastrian teaching. The idea of the resurrection of the body seems to have come from Persian sources, for except in the book of *Daniel*, written after 170 B.C., there was no such belief in the Old Testament. Among the Jews of Christ's time there were two parties: the Sadducees, who did not believe in the resurrection, and the Pharisees,[4] who did believe in the resurrection. Dr. Manson has argued cogently for the name Pharisee being a Jewish term for Parsee or Persian. This label was given to them because some of their beliefs, which differed from the older Judaism, were derived from Persian sources.

Secondly, there is the angelology and demonology of

[4] Probably the word Pharisee is a form of Parsee or Persian. I am not sure as to the word Sadducee, but I suggest that it is from the Semitic root Sadaqa (Arabic, he spoke the truth), which is seen in the well-known Arabic adjectives Sādiq and Siddiq — epithets of several Islamic personages, indicating their orthodoxy. If so, the Sadducees were the Sādiqis or men of orthodox belief.

Zoroastrianism, which certainly had some influence on New Testament teaching. Perhaps the seven lamps of fire round the throne in the Apocalypse are the six archangels and the angel Sraosha. The very word Paradise is Persian. Asmodaeus in the apocryphal book of *Tobit* is usually thought to be the Zoroastrian archdemon Aeshma Daeva—the demon of wrath. The close resemblance of the Devil to Anra Mainyu must strike anyone. The Devil is not a being of the Old Testament at all. In spite of popular belief, the Serpent of *Genesis* and Satan in the book of *Job* are quite different conceptions. Job's Satan is not a power opposing God, but a subordinate; the action which he took was taken with the permission and even the approval of Yahweh. But the picture of the Devil in the New Testament is exactly that of Anra Mainyu—the enemy of God, the tempter, the author of all evil. Modernists are perhaps disinclined to admit the existence of a personal Devil. I observe that in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, published thirty years ago, Dr. Garvie wrote:

> 'It may be confidently affirmed that belief in Satan is not now generally regarded as an essential article of the Christian faith, nor is it found to be an indispensable element of Christian experience.'

If we accept this view, we may decide that the whole body of demonology found in the New Testament—and perhaps we may add the story of the Temptation—was largely borrowed from Persian origins.

There is, so far as I know, no support in the New Testament for the idea of Purgatory. In Pahlawi writings the intermediate place is called the place of the Hamestakan. It does not, however, appear that prayers are offered for the Hamestakan, or that their state can be affected in any way by the action of others.

I cannot make more than a passing reference to the Wise Men who followed Christ's star. Traditionally they were Magi; Herzfeld refers to an old custom among the Magi of looking for a star which would be a sign of the Messiah. There is indeed some likeness between the Avestan Saoshyant and the Messiah expected by the Jews, but it does not appear to me to be very close.

Another small point perhaps worth noticing—the expression 'unclean spirits' used in the New Testament is said to have no

background in Jewish or Greek ideas. Of the Zoroastrian *daevas* or demons Jackson writes:

> 'All uncleanness attracts them; they abound, for example, in the vicinity of the *Dakhmas* where dead bodies are exposed.'

One particular form of Iranian religion—Mithraism—was, as is well known, a powerful rival of primitive Christianity. Its ideas certainly had an influence on the development of Christian belief, and probably affected the views of certain Jewish sects even before the time of Christ. Roughly speaking, Mithraism inculcated ideas common to all variations of Iranian religious thought. I cannot resist quoting from the article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* a list of resemblances between Mithraic and Christian belief and practice:

> 'The legend of the shepherds with their gifts and adoration; the use of bell and candle, holy water and the Communion; the sanctification of Sunday and of the 25th of December; the doctrines of heaven and hell, of primitive revelation, of the mediation of the Logos emanating from the divine, the atoning sacrifice, the constant warfare between good and evil; the immortality of the soul, the last judgment, the resurrection of the flesh, and the fiery destruction of the universe.'

Some of these resemblances appear rather forced. Many, if we accept them, may be the results of contact later than the Gospel times.

To sum up—there are a good many points where Iranian ideas have been reflected in the New Testament. During the later days of the Captivity, and after, the Jews came into close contact with Iran, and it would be strange if this had not affected them. We see this from *Daniel* and *Esther*, and *Judith* and *Tobit*, and other canonical and apochryphal books. Jewish and early Christian ideas of the Resurrection and final Judgment, and of immortality and the future life; of the Devil and the war between good and evil—these plainly owe much to Zoroastrian and Persian thought. But students are far too ready to imagine that their own subjects play a greater part in the drama of Life and the Universe than the facts really justify. It is not my opinion that Iranian ideas had a very great share in shaping either Jewish or Christian belief in regard to matters of really first-class religious importance. The old Jewish religion and neo-Platonism were the main foundations on which Christian belief was founded. Possibly this view of mine may be disappointing to some of my readers; to more, it may be a relief.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN INDIA*

The tendency towards secularism and materialism which is growing in India to-day is accentuated by the government system of education with its so-called religious neutrality, which is really religious hostility. One of the great contributions which can be made by mission educational work, whether of primary, secondary or university standard, is that it can give an education that is founded on religion. This does not mean that mission schools should aim at being centres of proselytism. In any case the law rightly bars the conversion of young people under a certain age, without the consent of their parents. Yet few can pass through a mission school without gaining something which would never be gained in a government or non-Christian school. The pupils consciously and unconsciously develop a Christian outlook, and use Christian standards of judgment.

> 'In sending out students,' writes Mr. Ryburn, 'who are no longer ignorant of the facts of life, of the facts of health, who have been taught to reason, to use the scientific method, who have seen the evils of hatred and of litigation, and of fear and dishonesty in social dealings, who have learned a right regard for women, mission schools and colleges are definitely helping to bring in the Kingdom of God in India . . . By the methods of teaching employed, and the type of education given, the school may develop in its pupils that for which there is the greatest necessity in India, namely, the critical, questioning mind.'

Incidentally the school or college can have a very close, valuable and dynamic relationship with the community in which it is placed, and its work can have far-reaching effects. Chiefly, though not solely, this relationship can be built up along the line of rural reconstruction work, which is one of the best methods of evangelism which the Christian forces in India are able to use.

> 'Through it we are able to come with a Gospel for the whole of life. It is a witness of religion in action, a demonstration of practical Christianity which comes nearer to the Gospel of Jesus Christ than possibly any other missionary activity.'

Nor is it only on the economic and social side that the school can make its contribution, high schools and colleges can prepare literature for villagers. This activity has the double advantage of encouraging creative literary work among the pupils in their mother tongue, and of supplying the need for books written for villagers in simple language and with suitable subject matter. Mr. Ryburn emphasizes the need 'to rescue the

* *The Hidden Leaven*, by W. M. Ryburn. National Christian Council, Nagpur, Central Provinces, India. 1 rupee.

Asramas, Past and Present, by P. Chenchiah, V. Chakkarai and A. N. Sudarisanan.

mother tongue from the Cinderella-like position into which it has fallen, and to encourage our pupils and students to write.' He points out as an example that the hymns in use everywhere are simply translations of English hymns. There is a great difficulty in finding Indian Christians who can write hymns in their own language.

> 'Our Christian poets are lamentably few in number. It should be the aim of educational work with Christians to produce Christian poets as well as prose writers. We need men and women who can express their religious experience in verse and prose in their own mother tongue, and who will not be constrained to borrow thought and language from the West.'

Mr. Ryburn has so many important and practical things to say that it is difficult in a review of reasonable length to do justice to them. He stresses the need for education in sex matters and social hygiene. He points out that not only is much education in India inadequate in extent but is also inadequate in quality, being 'far too academic, leading to a very narrow vocational field.' Parents who want white-collar jobs for their children are much to blame here. 'The villager does not take kindly to the idea of sending his boy to school to learn something which will not enable him to become a babu.'

Mr. Ryburn indicates that Christian influence in India is not by any means limited to institutional channels.

> 'One of the striking things in the religious situation to-day is the permeation of the mind and thinking of India by the teaching and principles of Jesus. Everywhere one finds that the ethical standards set forth by Jesus are consciously and unconsciously accepted by non-Christians, and that they are judging their own actions — and ours — by them. Christ's teaching is being followed by numbers who are not professing Christians . . .
>
> 'It must be remembered that sincerely religious Indians very often draw a sharp distinction between Jesus Christ and organized Christianity. Organized Christianity is associated with Western civilization. Jesus Christ does not belong to the West, and hence the willingness to welcome him.'

Believing as he does that one of the aims of Christian education should be to enable pupils and students to realize that they are part of a world-wide brotherhood, Mr. Ryburn remarks that

> 'There is one special field where this spirit is needed in India to-day, and that is in connection with Church union. Nowhere is the lack of Christian brotherhood more evident than in the refusal of some Christians to sit at the Lord's Table with others.'

The perusal of Mr. Ryburn's very inexpensive book, which deserves a far wider public in England than it will probably get, encourages the belief that there are immense possibilities in India for an enlightened education given by earnest, liberal, cultivated Christian men and women, who are

out to serve the people and not to proselytize them. *The Hidden Leaven* is a good title for a very fine book.

The *asrama* in ancient India was a kind of forest colony to which men retired for purposes of contemplation and the possession of their souls. The revival of *asramas* among both Christians and Hindus in our day is an educational and religious phenomenon of some importance. For *asramas* of to-day do not aim primarily at the contemplative life nor at retirement, but attempt to reach objective and scientific views of current affairs and to translate idealism into practical action. It is certainly true that 'To-day we need more than anything else a permanent group of disinterested thinkers in all departments of life.'

The idea is that the *asrama* enables a Christian group unit, a spiritual family, to be built up. It is found that 'the expansion of Christianity turns not on preaching but on making Christ intelligible to the Indian mind.' The Christian life, released from western forms, has to find self-expression, and the *asrama* is one such — the natural expression of the Christ spirit to an Indian. 'Indian Christians have been feeling for some time the general inadequacy of foreign institutions for the further growth of Christianity in India.' The Churches, as they are, have done their best, and that is not enough; a state of spiritual stalemate has been reached, and this the *asrama* may be able to resolve.

> 'The *asramas* are exhibiting, in some of them at least, the beauty of a non-sectarian, non-authoritarian, non-sacerdotal group of life . . . The union in the *asramas* is based on common life and work, not on formulas or compromise. They manifest the attraction of a Christian life as contrasted with the power of dogma, propaganda and preaching. *Asramas* are discovering that to live Christ is to preach Christ. The universalities of Christianity unobscured by the paraphernalia of the Church is emerging. Conversion is being divested of its false association and is seen as a transformation of life into the image of Jesus.'

Should the Christian *asrama* realize to any extent the promise of its calling, it will attract (1) Christians who are anxious to scale higher levels of Christian experience, and to reproduce Christ in their personal lives; (2) those who want to realize Christian principles in group life; (3) Hindus who wish to know what revelations have come to men outside Hinduism; (4) Hindus attracted by the teaching and example of Jesus who desire to reduce those teachings into practice, and who accept Jesus and his teachings without being prepared to accept the cultus of Christianity as embodied in the Church.

The perusal of these two books leads one to believe that the Christian religion is more alive in India than in Europe, if readiness to experiment be a sign of life. Perhaps England will one day be Christianized from India!

J.C.H.

THE TWO KINGDOMS*

This religious novel,* centering on the life and death of the Lord Jesus, contains little or nothing to suggest its Japanese origin, unless it be the artistic sensitiveness to the aspects of nature, and it does not read like a translation. But it contains much to identify it as the work of Toyohiko Kagawa, from the pen that years ago overwhelmed public interest in Japan in his book *Across the Deathline*. Kagawa himself is an ascetic and utter Christian communist in personal life, and a leader of reform for labour and poverty in Japan. For this he was imprisoned in 1921. But after the great earthquake of 1923 the government found he was indispensable, and the organization of Tokyo relief was put into his hands. Beginning with slum work, he has since turned to the redemption of rural life. But he does not fall into the snare of presenting Jesus Christ as a social reformer. The basic material of Kagawa's novel is almost wholly scriptural, but the treatment is highly imaginative. Minor persons of the New Testament narrative are developed into distinctive characters, and a few purely fictional are added. The main *motif* is no doubt that indicated by the title: the Kingdom of God which is love set against the kingdom of worldly power, and triumphing not in spite of but through suffering. Consonantly it starts from the point of view of the Zealots, after the death of John Baptist. Its tone will be welcomed by pacifists; and its text might be 'My kingdom is not of this world.' This is not didactically emphasized: but it underlies the selection of sayings and incidents. These seem to withhold some of the sterner elements of the gospel teaching as presented in the Synoptists. Sin is throughout treated as disease, for pity rather than for penalty. But in this there is nothing flabby, no mere sub-evangelical humanism. The Cross and Suffering are very central. The portrait of the Lord Jesus is Franciscan: Franciscan too in His light-heartedness. But He does not merely brave the Cross when it comes: He is always facing it. Confidence in the artistic instinct as well as the spiritual insight of the author checks criticism; but read as drama, on the background of the Christian faith, the grand *denouement* of the Resurrection might seem to be sketched with disappointing brevity, only five or six pages, following eighty pages devoted to intense detail of the Passion. But whatever may be thought of the emphasis of the book, the theology is that of the orthodox creed and gospel of Christendom. It makes no very fresh contribution to thought, but the presentation marks genius and deep spiritual reflection. The subjective analysis of character, as also the mysticism, is unexpected from a Japanese writer; but this, coupled with boldness of imagination, underlies the book throughout.

CECIL H. BOUTFLOWER.

* *The Two Kingdoms*, by Toyohiko Kagawa. Lutterworth Press, 1941. 8/6.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF LIBERTY*

'Tis liberty alone that gives the flower
Of fleeting life its lustre and perfume,
And we are weeds without it.

The theologian, Professor Hodgson, agrees with the poet Cowper in this appraisal of liberty. In a book consisting of reprints of three articles contributed to the religious press* he discusses the bearing of the Christian faith on the conception of liberty. We know freedom empirically. Against this knowledge philosophic determinism breaks down. Dr. Hodgson argues that it is impossible to explain our experience of freedom or give it an intelligible place in the universe if we are the mere by-products of a blind surge devoid of intelligent will. If, on the other hand, we are the creation of an intelligent free Being, then it is comprehensible that He should impart a share of His freedom to some of His creatures.

Freedom is of two kinds, freedom from external compulsion and freedom from internal self-slavery. The second is the more important.

> 'The undergraduate who discovers that his own inability to get out of bed in the morning is a more serious slavery than the College regulation which requires him to be within doors at midnight, has not entirely wasted his opportunities of higher education.'

We are under the external compulsion of what are commonly called 'laws of nature.' Dr. Hodgson interprets the orderliness in nature as a manifestation of the orderliness of the Creator. Man wins freedom from slavery to the conditions of the natural world in which he is placed, by investigating the uniformities which characterize the physical world and so increasing human control over the world. The orderliness of natural law is God's provision for the development of human freedom. In our prayers we may not ask Him to act in such a way as to hinder that development.

> 'For example, by the progress of the science of meteorology we are extending our power of self-expression and so increasing our freedom. By its aid ships can sail and aeroplanes fly with a security and regularity unknown before in history. Now, this science is developed by the co-ordination of multitudinous messages received by wireless from various directions, and if the receiver of them never knew in any particular case whether a message recorded is one item in the orderly network of weather conditions, or a special miracle performed in response to a prayer for fine weather for a Sunday-school treat, the whole possibility of the science would be destroyed.'

Inner freedom comes increasingly as a man hears the call of God to work creatively with Him in building the City of God. It is by making decisions and accepting responsibilities that he grows in freedom. He must not expect to avoid the growing-pains and responsibilities of self-hood.

* *The Christian Idea of Liberty*, by Leonard Hodgson, D.D. Published by the Student Christian Movement Press, 1941. 1/6.

In this connexion Dr. Hodgson utters a salutary warning:

> 'Divine guidance is not normally a matter of inexplicable inner urges to actions of which no reasonable account can be given, and one does well to be suspicious of the rightness of any decision for which one can give no reason except a feeling that it is God's will. There is danger of using the notion of divine guidance as a way of avoiding personal responsibility for one's actions. It is a good working rule to say that if a man is challenged as to some practical decision he has made, he ought to be able to explain the grounds on which he acted without mentioning God at all. God's method of creating the Christian's freedom and selfhood is by bidding him look out upon the world and bend his mind to the discovery of what action is demanded by each problem as it presents itself; and there is joy in heaven over every man who honestly accepts the responsibility of his acts.'

G. L. H. Harvey.

DOCTRINE—STATIC OR DYNAMIC?

Miss Phyllis Dent is an expert in matters relating to the theory and practice of Sunday School management and teaching. It is therefore surprising that the task of reviewing her little book* on the subject of doctrinal teaching should have proved to be as difficult as it has been. Judging by its title and its size (62 pages), one naturally expected it to be an essay setting forth cogent reasons in favour of the teaching of Christian Doctrine to children. Apparently, however, the author thinks this question — to teach or not to teach doctrine — has been settled, and her book turns out to be a very sketchy survey of what she considers the right way to teach 'Churchmanship' (which term seems, for her, to be synonymous with 'Christian Doctrine') to children of all ages ranging from infancy to adolescence. In 62 pages, this cannot be done, even sketchily, and we might add, not even by Miss Dent (we say this with respect). The scope and range of the task are too terrifyingly great.

The book thus falls between two stools. It is neither a convincing case for dogmatic teaching, nor is it an effective handbook for teachers. Yet there are excellences in it which make one wish Miss Dent would *really* tackle her subject. Granted the advisability of teaching doctrine, she is right to insist that in its presentation to children the four stages in the process of the evolution of any particular doctrine should form the skeleton of every lesson. The children must be shown (*a*) the original experience as set out in the Scriptures, (*b*) the process of thought which followed upon that experience, (*c*) the formulation of the doctrine arising from the thoughts, and (*d*) the practical testing of the doctrine in everyday life. This is sound, for so, in the past, were the doctrines of the Church builded. Now of these four stages, we suggest that (*a*) is by far the most important.

* *Teaching Doctrine*, by Phyllis Dent. St. Christopher Press, Westminster. pp. 62. 1937 (Second Edition, revised).

It is in fact vital. Only by studying critically, in the light of all the available information, historical and scientific, can we know 'what happened.' Accurate knowledge of the 'facts' is essential to the framing of any hypothesis. And doctrines erected upon imperfectly known or untrue 'facts' are false doctrines. Miss Dent seems to us to dismiss this stage with an almost fundamentalist abandon. So the text reads, so it is. Where she *does* permit herself a little 'criticism,' she is unfortunate in her choice of an incident, and wholly unconvincing, even to children, we suspect (*e.g.* page 47, section B). It is possible to teach children of 12+ to read their Bibles intelligently — perhaps too intelligently for the survival of much that is called 'traditional doctrine.' But it is on this kind of reading that Sunday Schools ought to concentrate. Christian truth is dynamic, not static.

The last chapter, however, reveals a sincerity of thought and a command of good language which makes us hope the author will let us have a more ambitious work. But let it be either an *apologia*, or a hand-book. This one is neither. The revised edition still carries a misprint — page 45, line 25.

Whilst on the subject of doctrine and its presentation, it may be as well to draw readers' attention to a little volume of five lectures[1] delivered in Westminster Abbey during Lent, 1940, by the late Canon Vernon Storr, former sub-Dean and Rector of St. Margaret's. The title of the course, 'The True and Living God,' is sufficiently indicative of the subject. The author was that rare combination of the scholar and the saint. He was a prominent member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and President of the A.E.G.M. As a member of the Commission on Doctrine he unquestionably contributed much to the atmosphere of tolerant and spacious charity which surely colours that long-awaited production.

In these lectures we see how Storr taught doctrine. Here he is expounding to an everyday lay audience the Christian Doctrine of God as deduced from an enlightened reading of Holy Scripture. The result is a perfect little specimen of his genius for 'persuading' his hearers into a more progressive and wiser theology. He treats of God as Personal, God in Nature, God in History, God the Father, God and the Cross, and although the truths taught and the doctrines implied are fundamental and profound, the language in which they are set forth is simple to a degree. There are in these lectures, as in all Storr's popular discourses, 'pools of thought where elephants may swim and lambs may wade.'

Here is the good Modernist at work (for such he was). The lectures would make an ideal text-book for a Study Circle, in that they are scholarly without being technical, profound and not prolix, and, what is very important for the practical teacher or leader, scrupulously devoid of offence to

[1] *The True and Living God,* by Canon V. F. Storr, M.A. S.P.C.K. pp. 64. 1940. 2/-.

the old-fashioned. He pleads always for doctrine that shall take account of all knowledge, ancient as well as modern.

> 'Let us be patient,' he writes, 'and remember that Truth is one, and that there can be no final contradiction between revelation and knowledge reached in other ways.'

R. B. Parker.

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND*

Retirement has not diminished Dr. Oesterley's literary output, and there is no danger of his long list of published works in 'Crockford' being equalled or overtaken by any other clergyman. The purpose of his latest work is clearly stated in the Prefatory Note:—

> 'The importance of the study of Judaism, *i.e.* the Jewish religion as developed during and after the Exile, and especially the forms it assumed during the Greek period, needs no insisting on. Christianity was born of Judaism, the study of which is a necessary preliminary to the understanding of much that we read in the New Testament. In many respects Judaism was, under divine providence, a preparation for Christianity. To illustrate this is the main object of the present volume. It will be found that there are a large number of passages quoted from Jewish writings belonging to the Greek Period. We have given many quotations in preference to merely indicating references, because the editions of the writings in question are not always available to the general reader. It must be emphasized that this book is not intended for specialists in the subject; rather, it is written for those who may be interested in the somewhat intricate investigation but who are unable to find the time to study the sources and the various works of authoritative information and knowledge, and to whom the present writer is much indebted.'

There is little here that will be unfamiliar to those who have read the books Dr. Oesterley has previously written either alone or in collaboration with Dr. T. H. Robinson. It covers the ground already occupied by such excellent works as Fairweather's 'The Background of the Gospels' and Guignebert's 'The Jewish World in the time of Jesus.' It is not, perhaps, quite so good as the latter, but costs only half the price. The vast number of topics discussed in the twenty-four chapters necessarily precludes any detailed treatment of each, but there is a lucid introduction to the various aspects of the period and reference to other works which give a fuller treatment. The best parts of the book are the discussion of the extensive influence of Persian religion upon Judaism, and the treatment of the phases of the confused Messianic expectation. Dr. Oesterley, wisely perhaps, discards the term Messiah, and prefers to talk about an 'ideal figure.' He emphasizes the purely historical importance of the Messianic hope and refuses to assign it any evidential value:

> 'We must begin by emphasizing the fact that various passages have, in times long subsequent to their origin, been interpreted in what

* *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity.* By W. O. E. Oesterley. S.P.C.K. 1941. Price 10/6.

is called a "Messianic" sense; but these passages, read in the sense which the writers intended, do not lend themselves to this interpretation. We are far from denying the justification of discerning in the passages in question the foreshadowing of truths; we only affirm that the writers themselves had no knowledge of this, and that it is, therefore, inappropriate to describe such passages as Messianic prophecies' (p. 137).

Dr. Oesterley has attempted to shew how the beliefs and practices of Judaism link on to the New Testament, but this is the least satisfactory part of the book. Not only is the discussion somewhat superficial from lack of space, but Dr. Oesterley's treatment of the New Testament is hesitant and timid compared with his firm and liberal handling of the Old Testament text. It causes him much distress that Jesus appears to have shared the common belief in the demoniacal origin of disease. He appears to rank the Fourth Gospel as history and not theology, and reads the Gospels in the light of orthodox Christology. It is for this reason that readers of the *Modern Churchman* will probably prefer Guignebert's work. Nevertheless, those who desire a helpful sketch of the period between Malachi and Matthew and realize the importance of the Apocrypha in the development of Jewish thought will find Dr. Oesterley's book of great value.

P. R. Smythe.

ANTIDOTE TO FEAR*

These essays by the Regius Professor of Physic in the University of Cambridge should help many people to overcome certain common fears which beset them. If past generations feared death and what might follow it, people to-day are affected rather by the fear of dying. Sudden death is reckoned rather to be a blessing than a thing to pray to be delivered from. Dr. Ryle gives reasons why the fear of dying is largely groundless. Certain forms of death are so instantaneous, and others from various forms of coma are approached through a period of such unconsciousness, that there can be no apprehension or distressing sensation. In the case of deaths from accident, those who have escaped such an end by the skin of their teeth have recorded that they felt no fear but had chiefly been conscious in retrospect of the quick reflex adjustments to save or protect themselves. As for less swift deaths from acute illness, *e.g.* pneumonia, or from wounds or haemorrhage, there are accounts from good observers, including medical men, who have emerged alive from such conditions, that when to the bedside watcher they appeared in their greatest distress, their actual state of consciousness was like a dream or state of partial anaesthesia and that they knew little or no suffering. Shock, haemorrhage, and fever, or a combination of them, are likely to dim consciousness almost as efficiently as the hypodermic needle, owing to the physico-chemical disturbances in-

* *Fears may be Liars*, by John A. Ryle, M.D. Allen and Unwin, 1941. 3/6.

volved. How far the fear of death has been lessened by the decline of belief in the horrors of hell and purgatory is an interesting point; the fear of dying has certainly been diminished by the use of morphia.

Dr. Ryle has an essay on Life and Living as well as on Death and Dying, in which he urges his readers to make it their concern to know what is knowable, and on the basis of such knowledge to do what ought to be done. He deprecates profitless speculations.

> 'Every hour spent in wondering vainly about the ultimate past and future of things, every minute expended in the contemplation of a possible life after death, or in attempting to secure the conditions of personal salvation, is an hour or a minute subtracted from the time allotted for this wonderful gift of actual life.'

Yet may no speculation itself be a part of life? Has not the apparently profitless instinct of curiosity promoted the advance of science? And how can one know what ought to be done unless one has acquired some convictions about the meaning and value of life, which convictions can hardly be secured apart from some measure of speculation? If life has no value, what is the point of medical science, save as providing means of swift euthanasia? Unfortunately 'obstinate questionings' can hardly be avoided, however great a waste of time they may appear to be. J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

A NON-SECTARIAN METHOD OF TEACHING CHRISTIAN RELIGION

SIR,

Writing in your December number on 'the crux of religious education' you lament the fact that religious instruction in the Church schools is for the most part sectarian. I wonder whether it really deserves this description? I have watched the development of early religious teaching for a long time, and I am quite sure of one significant change in recent years. The best Church teachers of young children no longer feel bound to use dogmatic terms, explaining the unfamiliar words as best they may. This does not mean that they have neglected doctrine (as the champions of Simple Bible Teaching once wanted all teachers of the young to do), but that they have found a new approach to it. They are not content to convey Christian truths at that stage in the forms finally adopted by the Church in its work of safeguarding them from error, and therefore expressed in language which seems to the children irrelevant to life as they see life. Rather they invite the learners to share the process by which the Church was led through centuries of Christian thought and experience to formulate its beliefs as it did. What made them express their convictions about the divinity of Christ, about the Trinity, about the future life, in the terms of the Creed? Thus the children are prepared for formal statements about these and other convictions when they are ready for them. To present them too soon is to hinder rather than to commend their acceptance. When such a method as

this is generally acknowledged and practised as the right use of Bible teaching we shall have arrived at a preparatory stage of religious instruction free from sectarian differences, and leading equally to all the varying tenets of separate Christian bodies. Has not this prospect a bearing on the crux?

Yours, etc.,

Bishop's Lodge, Liverpool. ALBERT LIVERPOOL.

[We are glad to publish the Bishop of Liverpool's letter calling attention to a new method of giving Christian instruction to the young — a method which is neither 'Simple Bible Teaching' on the one hand nor traditional dogmatic teaching on the other.

In our issue of February, 1941 (pp. 440-441), we drew attention to Dr. David's exposition of this method of 'elements,' and referred our readers to *Teaching Doctrine* by Phyllis Dent (National Society, 1*s*.), which contains a helpful exposition of it. Fr. Drinkwater's *Teaching the Catechism* (Burns Oates, 6*s*.), an example of the 'concentric' method closely allied to the method of 'elements,' was also commended by Dr. David.—ED., *M.C.*]

M.C.U. COUNCIL ELECTION, 1942

SIR,

Council Elections have been suspended since the beginning of the war, but the Council has decided that it is now possible and desirable to hold an election. In view of the period which has elapsed since the last election, in 1939, the conditions of the election will be different from usual, and the Council has decided upon the following procedure as being most nearly in accordance with the constitution.

The ten members elected in 1939 shall continue to serve for another year and retire in 1943. They are:—Miss A. M. Ashley, Rev. T. J. Childs, Rev. R. G. Jackson, Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, Rev. T. H. Maxfield, Rev. Dr. G. W. Butterworth, Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Mr. J. H. Simpson and Canon N. Sykes.

All other members of the Council, whether elected or co-opted, shall retire at the Annual General Meeting in 1942, but shall *all* be eligible for re-election. Their names will be found on the cover of the *Modern Churchman*.

The ten members who obtain the highest number of votes shall serve for three years, and the next ten for two years. (Twenty members are to be elected this year.) The Council will seek authority at the General Meeting to extend the period of office of the Council for any period necessitated by war conditions.

Nominations of candidates must reach the Secretary not later than April 1st, 1942. The names must be proposed and seconded by members of the Union, and the consent of the nominees should first be obtained. Any member may nominate one or more (up to four) candidates for election to the Council.

If more than twenty nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all members of the Union. There will be an Annual General Meeting of the Union this year; the date is not yet fixed, but it will be towards the end of May or the beginning of June.

T. J. WOOD,
Organising Secretary.

249 Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square,
London, W.C.2.
February 5th, 1942.

THE DECALOGUE IN OUR PRAYER BOOK

SIR,

Your excellent remarks about the Decalogue (*Modern Churchman*, January, p. 439) prompt me to tell you that I have not used the lengthened form for nearly twenty years. Few people seem to know that the earlier form is part of the Catechism in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. It is therefore not a Modernist innovation. The full form appeared in 1552 not only in the Catechism but also in the Communion Service. In Barry's opinion this was 'partly on account of the mutilation of the Commandments common then, and still not infrequent in Romish manuals' (*The Teacher's Prayer Book*, 1882).

As variants I use not only the two Gospel Commandments, but also the Eight Beatitudes. I believe I owe the suggestion to Stopford Brooke and Mrs. Humphrey Ward. Since our last Conference I have also used the New Commandment in *John* xiii, 34, 35. I owe this to Dr. C. J. Wright at our united Girton Communion on August 31st, 1939.

T. F. ROYDS.

Haughton Rectory, Stafford.
February 2nd, 1942.

THE LORD'S PRAYER AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

SIR,

Quite apart from the tragic disunity which prevails among the different Christian denominations, there is another significant point which up to the present seems to have been ignored. And it may well be that this more than any other single factor has been responsible for the fact that to-day no less than four-fifths of the population are outside the influence of Church membership.

It is the totally different principle and method of teaching. Up to, and including, the Victorian age children were not taught to think and reason things out for themselves. They had, as it were, no freedom of thought. This same spirit pervaded the whole intellectual life—it was wrong to challenge traditional conviction. Children were given information and were expected to accept and believe it, and were indeed required to do so. This unfortunate method was also the foundation-stone of the home upbringing. Children were not allowed to question authority. It was natural, therefore, that in this atmosphere both at home and at school the young developing mind automatically accepted traditional doctrine.

But teaching methods have changed. Children are taught to think and reason things out for themselves, and therefore in essence to reject what they themselves cannot honestly believe. This is bound to have had a profound influence on all aspects of religious education, and intensified and aggravated by the fact that the teachers of religious education are themselves disunited on even fundamental issues. Surely it is a case of a house divided against itself. If there cannot be unity in spiritual things, how can we expect to attain unity in things material? In the 'Signs of the Times' is this observation: 'The general reading of the Bible to-day creates for many more religious difficulties than it solves.' 'To-day' because reasoning things out for oneself is the dominant note in all true education.

Christianity is admittedly a life and not a creed; and this should surely be the aim and object of all religious instruction. The necessarily limited time which can be given to religious education in schools should be restricted to the New Testament. The reason that I would give for discouraging the

use of the Old Testament to any appreciable extent in schools is that it inculcates into the child mind thoughts of the nature of God far removed from the truth as revealed by the Founder of Christianity.

It seems to me that everlasting good would come of making the basis not only of religious education in schools, but the basis of all Christian education, the eternal truths embodied in the Lord's Prayer. It is a picture of the life of Christ, it is a picture of the mind of God, utterly free from sectarian distinctions and prejudices. Surely the only condition which will make for anything like permanent peace in the world, when the present clash of arms is finished, will be the conception both in theory and in practice of a world family. The Lord's Prayer is the great integrating power by which and through which the ideal of a world family could become a reality. The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the Christian religion. Is not this the only infallible and unalterable body of Christian doctrine? This war is surely a challenge to this Truth. May it not also be a challenge to the Churches to pave the way by resolving their difficulties and differences to this end?

H.W.B.

7th January, 1942.

A REVISED BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

SIR,

'There is no clear evidence that Jesus Christ instituted and commanded Baptism as a necessity for his disciples.' So you have written in the December number of *The Modern Churchman* (p. 401). Can we not go further and say that Jesus did not institute baptism, but accepted a baptism already instituted by the Baptist? If this be so, surely the story of the Baptism of Jesus should be read at every Baptismal Service, and the order of the service conformed more closely to the Scriptural pattern:

Minister. N., I baptize thee, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Parent or Godparent. Father, by thy Holy Spirit, ever make this child thine own.

Minister. I will be to *him* a Father, said the Lord, and *he* shall be my *son*.

Minister. We receive this child into . . . .

ALFRED J. WALKER.

Staplehurst Rectory, Kent.

NOTICE TO READERS.

We desire to direct the attention of our readers to a loose inset in this number of the *Modern Churchman*. The inset deals with the coming election of twenty members to the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, announced in the correspondence pages of this issue, and urges the importance of *all* electors recording their votes promptly on receiving voting papers which should reach the electors in April.

ED. *M.C.*